

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Rejection being responded to the Examiner has rejected claims 10, 16, and 17, all of the claims remaining in the application, again, 35 USC 103(a), on the combination of Calhoun patent 6,463,475 in view of Murakawa patent publication US 2001/0020273. The lack of relevance of these references to applicants' invention has been fully set forth in the prior amendments filed in this application, and specifically at page 5-7 of the Amendment entered with the Request for Reexamination of December 14, 2004, and the Amendment of November 3, 2004. Of crucial significance is that Murakawa's teaching is directly opposite to applicants' invention in that in Murakawa a plurality of virtual pipes are required with each external device establishing its own virtual pipe, whereas in accordance with applicants' invention the local device, through a secure hub, causes the establishment of the single virtual pipe and assignment of a secondary IP address. Calhoun, which is even more remote from applicants' invention than Murakawa, is not directed to bypassing security access apparatus. While in Calhoun there are virtual pipes or tunnels, these tunnels, for an entirely different purpose, are again established by the external devices and not in response to the local device through a secure hub.

The Examiner, in responding to applicants' immediately prior Amendment, has stated that "the features upon which applicant relies ("i.e., *the first or local communication device establish* the virtual pipe and is assigned the IP address, which gives the local device an appearance on the *external network*") are not recited in the rejected claims.

Accordingly, in response to the Examiner's criticism of applicants' prior claims, applicants propose to cancel those claims and to submit two new claims 18 and 19 in their stead.

New claim 18 recites that it is the secure hub which is connected to the public network that includes the means for establishing the virtual pipe between the first communication device and itself in response to the first communication device. The secure hub, as recited in new claim 18, also includes the pool of addresses from which one can be assigned to the first communication device and the means for associating the assigned IP address to the virtual pipe for the first communication device.

Similarly, new claim 19 recites "a secure hub including routing and switching functionalities, interfaces to the public network, means in response to the first communication device for establishing a virtual pipe between said secure hub and the first communication device for tunneling communication and bypassing said security access blocking apparatus, and means for assigning a secondary IP address to said first communication device and associating said secondary IP address with said established virtual pipe, whereby said secondary IP address gives said first communication device a second appearance on said local network".

The recitations with respect to the secure hub are set forth in applicants' specification at page 3, line 23 et seq.

Applicants submit that new claims 18 and 19 clearly recite how the secure hub in response to the first communication device establishes the virtual tunnel but also performs other functions not suggested by or performed by Calhoun's tunnel switch 100, since Calhoun is not concerned with bypassing the firewall, i.e., the security access blocking apparatus, but with managing traffic in a system having a plurality of such tunnel connections to the local network.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that new claims 18 and 19 are clearly allowable. Withdrawal of the Final Rejection, entry of this Amendment, favorable consideration and allowance of new claims 18 and 19, and passage of this application to issue are therefore requested.

Applicants believe that new claims 18 and 19 respond to the Examiner's objection that the asserted features of applicants' invention were not recited in applicants' claims. If the Examiner deems that still further distinction should be made in the claims, based on applicants' specification, the Examiner is solicited to call applicants' attorney with respect to such additional language the Examiner deems necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

David Marples et al

By: 
James W. Falk
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 16,154
(732) 699-4465